REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-10, and 14-26 are presently pending. Claims 21-26 are added. Claims 1, 4-10, and 14-20 stand rejected. Reconsideration and continued examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 10, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by van Diggelen. Claim 1 is amended to recite, among other limitations, "forming packets in response to said plurality of satellite navigation data streams to generate a plurality of packetized satellite navigation data streams, wherein each one of the plurality of subframes carrying different portions of ephemeris data, and each one of the plurality of subframes carrying different portions of the almanac from one of the plurality of satellite navigation streams are placed in different packets".

Although Examiner has indicated that van Diggelen teaches "forming packets (col. 3, lines 38-40; col. 4, lines 16-23) in response to said plurality of satellite navigation streams to generate a plurality of packetized satellite navigation data streams", col. 3, lines 38-40 merely teaches: "Emphemeris information comprises **a 900 bit packet** containing satellite position and clock information".

Assignee first notes that van Diggelen uses the singular form "a 900 bit packet" while the claim as amended uses the plural form "different portions of ephemeris data … from one of the plurality of navigation streams are placed in different packets".

Additionally, claims 1, 11, and 20 now claim "and each one of the plurality of subframes carrying different

portions of the almanac from one of the plurality of satellite navigation streams are placed in different packets".

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1, 11, and 20.

Additionally, claim 21 is added reciting, among other limitations, "wherein removing further comprises removing some of the packets if some of the packets carrying some of the plurality of subframes carrying different portions of the ephemeris data or the another plurality of subframes carrying different portions of the almanac from the one of the plurality of satellite navigation streams that are duplicate and retaining remaining packets carrying a remainder of the plurality of subframes carrying different portions of the ephemeris data or the another plurality of subframes carrying different portions of the almanac data from the one of the plurality of satellite navigation streams."

Although Examiner has indicated that van Diggelen teaches "removing (col. 3, lines 41-46), at said processing system duplicate packets", it is noted that Col. 3, Line 44-45 state "removes duplicate occurrences of the same ephemeris". It is noted that while van Diggelen discusses removal of the "same ephmeris" as a whole, claim 21 is directed to "removing some of the packets if some of the packets carrying some of the plurality of subframes carrying different portions of the ephemeris data … are duplicate and retaining remaining packets carrying a remainder of the plurality of subframes carrying different

portions of the ephemeris data". Additionally Claim 26 recites, "wherein removing further comprises removing a duplicate packet carrying the different portion of the ephemeris data, while retaining the rest of the plurality of packets that carry the different portions of the ephemeris data for the one of the satellite navigation data streams". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests allowance for claims 21 and 26.

Additionally, claim 22 is added reciting, among other limitations, "removing further comprises removing a duplicate packet carrying the different portion of the almanac." Again, it is noted that "it is noted that Col. 3, Line 44-45 state "removes duplicate occurrences of the same ephemeris". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests allowance for claim 22.

Finally, although moot in view of the amendments, in the Office Action at 14, Examiner has stated:

> First in the response submitted 7/17/06 applicant admitted at page 4, sections 0013, 0014, that data transmitted over the Internet using internet protocol are in IP packets. The applicant futher states that the act of removing duplicates automatically forms a combine packet stream, applications specification section 0013-0015.

Assignee respectfully disagrees with Examiner's characterization of the response submitted 7/17/06, page 4, sections 0013 and 0014, as well as Examiner's characterization of applications specification section 0013-0015, and submits that the foregoing written correspondence speaks entirely for itself.

Examiner also stated that:

> Applicant's quotations and citations from the prior art clearly indicate applicant's admission that the prior art anticipates the claims.

This time, Examiner does not even identify that particular writing of Applicant that allegedly "clearly indicate applicant's admission that the prior art anticipates the claims." Assignee would appreciate if Examiner would provide citation to the statement that is being referred to. However, if Examiner is referring to the response to the previous office action, Assignee flatly disagrees with Examiner's characterization of Assignee's remarks. Again, the Response to the previous Office Action speaks entirely for itself.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that each of the pending claims are allowable and Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fees or credit overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: January 30, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

                                 Mirut Dalal
                                 Reg. No. 44,052
                                 Attorney for Applicants

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100